

From the:
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

PCT
WRITTEN OPINION
(PCT Rule 66)

To: Cullen & Co GPO Box 1074 BRISBANE QLD 4001			Date of mailing (day/month/year) 24 MAY 2004
Applicant's or agent's file reference 021099PC/RG		REPLY DUE within TWO MONTHS from the above date of mailing	
International Application No. PCT/AU2003/001348	International Filing Date (day/month/year) 10 October 2003	Priority Date (day/month/year) 11 October 2002	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC Int. Cl. ⁷ G07F 11/16, B65H 5/10			
Applicant VEND-TECH SOLUTIONS HOLDINGS PTY LTD et al			

1. This written opinion is the **first** drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - I ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - II ☐ Priority
 - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
 - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - VI ☐ Certain documents cited
 - VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
 - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application
3. The **FINAL DATE** by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is:
11 February 2005

The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the Reply Due date indicated above. However, the Australian Patent Office will not establish the Report before the earlier of (i) a response being filed, or (ii) one month before the Final Date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established. The Report will take into account any response (including amendments) filed before the Report is established. If no response is filed by 1 month before the Final Date, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

Applicants wishing to have the benefit of a further opinion (if needed) before the report is established should ensure that a response is filed at least 3 months before the Final Date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established.

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AU
AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE
PO BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AUSTRALIA
E-mail address: pct@ipaustralia.gov.au
Facsimile No. (02) 6285 3929

Authorized Officer

I.A. KILBEY

Telephone No. (02) 6283 2115

I. Basis of the opinion**1. With regard to the elements of the international application:***

- ☒ the international application as originally filed.
- ☐ the description, pages , as originally filed,
pages , filed with the demand,
pages , received on with the letter of
- ☐ the claims, pages , as originally filed,
pages , as amended under Article 19,
pages , filed with the demand,
pages , received on with the letter of
- ☐ the drawings, pages , as originally filed,
pages , filed with the demand,
pages , received on with the letter of
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
pages , as originally filed
pages , filed with the demand
pages , received on with the letter of

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages
- ☐ the claims, Nos.
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig.

5. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

** Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed"*

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 5-6, 14	YES
	Claims 1-4, 7-13	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	YES
	Claims 1-14	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-14	YES
	Claims	NO

2. Citations and explanations

(a) EP 193797 (b) EP 1178448 (c) EP 8119 (d) WO 01/96142 (e) FR 2273329

NOVELTY: CLAIMS 1-4, 7-13

It is held to be clearly apparent that the each of citations (a)-(d) discloses all of the features of the invention as defined by claims 1-4, 7-13 when read in the light of common general knowledge in the field and thus the invention defined by the above claims is not novel in the light of each of these citations.

INVENTIVE STEP: CLAIMS 1-14

For claims 1-4, 7-13 see above.

It is considered that it would be readily apparent to a person skilled in the art that the mobile base (4) of citation (e) could be used in the storage compartments of the vending machines of citations (a)-(d) if such was advantageous and thus that the subject matter of claims 5-6 is lacking in an inventive step in the light of such obvious combinations of documents.

It is considered that it would be obvious to a person skilled in the art, drawing on common general knowledge in the field, to incorporate information in the form of recorded messages in the vending machines of citations (a)-(d) and thus claim 14 is also considered to lack an inventive step in the light of citations (a)-(d) in this respect also.